

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated June 29, 2005 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1–23 and 26–33 are pending in the present application, with claims 1–16 being withdrawn from consideration.

In the Office Action, claims 17–19, 22, 27–29 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,788,384 to Ko et al. (hereinafter “Ko”); claims 22–23 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. as applied to claims 17–19, 22, 27–29 and 32 above; and claims 20–21, 26 and 30–31 are objected to as depending upon a rejected base claim.

Applicants appreciate the indication from the Examiner that claims 20–21, 26 and 30–31 contain allowable subject matter.

In the Office Action, claims 17–19, 22, 27–29 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ko. Applicants traverse the rejection of independent claim 17 and request reconsideration. Independent claim 17 is allowable in that it recites “a common auxiliary electrode in the pixel region corresponding the periphery of the pixel region and having a crossing portion crossing the pixel region, the crossing portion of the common auxiliary electrode being substantially parallel to the gate line.” Nothing in Ko teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention. Examiner cites the “second side electrode 45” of Ko as teaching this feature. Applicants respectfully point out that the second side electrode of Ko is not substantially parallel to the gate line. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 17, and its dependent claims 18–19 and 22, are allowable over Ko.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of independent claim 27 and request reconsideration. Independent claim 27 is allowable in that it recites “a common auxiliary electrode in the pixel region corresponding the periphery of the pixel region and having a crossing portion crossing the pixel region, the crossing portion of the common auxiliary

electrode being substantially parallel to the gate lines,” and “electric field inducing windows formed on the common electrode in respective ones of the sub-regions of the pixel region.” Nothing in Ko teaches or suggests at least these features of the claimed invention. Regarding the “electric field inducing window” of the claimed invention, the Examiner cites elements 47 and 47a of Ko as teaching this feature. Applicants respectfully point out that elements 47 and 47a are “dielectric frames,” which are “dielectrics, and include a material such as acrylic or Banzocyclobutene (BCB) and black resin.” (Column 6, lines 41–43). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 27, and its dependent claims 28–29 and 30–31, are allowable over Ko.

In the Office Action, claims 22–23 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. as applied to claims 17–19, 22, 27–29 and 32 above. Given the phrasing of this rejection, Applicants respectively suggest that the Examiner intended to cite Ko instead of Kim. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 22–23. Claims 22–23, which depend from claim 17, are allowable in that Ko fails to teach or suggest “a common auxiliary electrode in the pixel region corresponding the periphery of the pixel region and having a crossing portion crossing the pixel region, the crossing portion of the common auxiliary electrode being substantially parallel to the gate line.” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 22–23 are allowable over Ko.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 33 and request reconsideration. Claim 33, which depends from claim 27, is allowable because Ko fails to teach or suggest “a common auxiliary electrode in the pixel region corresponding the periphery of the pixel region and having a crossing portion crossing the pixel region, the crossing portion of the common auxiliary electrode being substantially parallel to the gate lines,” and “electric field inducing windows formed on the common electrode in respective ones of the sub-regions of the pixel region.” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 33 is allowable over Ko, for the same reasons as stated above.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Application No.: 10/603,766
Amdt. dated September 27, 2005
Reply to Office Action dated June 29, 2005

Docket No.: 8733.832.00

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: September 27, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Eric J. Nuss

Registration No.: 40,106
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant